

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

CARLOS VEGA *et al.*,
Plaintiffs

v.

CITY OF PHILADELPHIA *et al.*,
Defendants

:
:
:
:
:
:
:


CIVIL ACTION

No. 19-4039

ORDER

AND NOW, on this 16th day of September, 2022, upon consideration of Plaintiffs' Motion *in Limine* to Preclude Defendants From Presenting or Eliciting Testimony or Evidence Pertaining to Plaintiff Vega's Participation, Involvement or Conduct As a Prosecutor In Any Specific Case Other Than *Scott/Muhammed* as a Reason for Plaintiff Vega's Termination (Doc. No. 77) and the responses and replies thereto (Doc. Nos. 82, 90), it is hereby **ORDERED** that the Motion (Doc. No. 77) is **DENIED AT THIS TIME WITHOUT PREJUDICE**.¹

BY THE COURT:



GENE E.K. PRATTER
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

¹ Plaintiffs argue that evidence pertaining to cases other than *Scott/Muhammed* would be irrelevant under Fed. R. Evid. 402 because Mr. Krasner's deposition testimony did not identify any other cases as forming the basis for his decision to terminate Mr. Vega. Plaintiffs' motion is very broad, however, and evidence pertaining to other cases may, however, become relevant at trial; the Court therefore will reserve judgment on any particular item of evidence until it has been raised in a particular context during trial.